

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 22 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:	:	
Hummel, U.	:	Art Unit: 2133
	:	
Appln. No.: 10/604,579	:	Conf. No.: 1578
	:	
Filed: July 31, 2003	:	Examiner: Lamarre, G.
	:	
For: <i>Method For Parametrizing an</i>	:	Docket No.: WEM-032.02
<i>Integrated Circuit and an Integrated</i>	:	
<i>Circuit Therefor</i>	:	

Certificate of Transmission under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on February 22, 2005 to facsimile number 703-872-9306.

Signature: Teresa Barbuto
Teresa Barbuto

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE

Sir:

Applicant responds to the non-final Office Action mailed October 29, 2004. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any required fee occasioned by this paper, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1448.

Claims 1-21 were pending and remain pending.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over "Applicants' Admitted prior art" in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,973,900 to Sher (hereinafter "Sher"), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,627,784 to Roohparvar (hereinafter

"Roohparvar"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,493,532 to McClure (hereinafter "McClure"). The Examiner stated that "Admitted prior art substantially discloses the claimed means for parametrization" (Office Action, p. 1), but the Examiner acknowledged that "Admitted prior art," Sher, and Roohparvar do not describe applying a voltage level that is higher than the normal operating voltage level to the supply voltage pins or terminals. However, the Examiner stated that "Roohparvar does not restrict supervoltage application exclusively to address/write enable pins: non-dedicated terminals may also be supply voltage pins/terminals in Fig. 14" (Office Action, October 29, 2004, bottom of page 4) and that McClure "sketches/lays out such a supply voltage terminal arrangement" (Office Action, top of page 5). The Examiner also stated that the combination of "Admitted prior art," Sher, Roohparvar, and McClure was obvious because "modification would provide the procedure of Admitted prior art/Sher/Roohparvar with a cost/hardware savings technique whereby allocation of a terminal/pin/pad exclusively dedicated for supervoltage application is avoided." (Office Action, page 5, second paragraph).

In response, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to reconsider this position. Roohparvar explicitly states that "a high voltage [is applied] to two or more terminals 240 and 242 *of the memory system* from an external source. These terminals are non-dedicated terminals *used during normal memory operations*." (col. 22, lines 37-40, with emphasis added). This means that Roohparvar requires that the test mode high voltage be applied to a memory system terminal. Roohparvar does not leave open the possibility of applying the test mode high voltage to another sort of terminal. Roohparvar also emphasizes that the "test mode commands *must* be applied to the data I/O terminals *of the memory*" (col. 22,


lines 25-26, with emphasis added). It is clear from these passages that Roohparvar teaches away from applying test mode high voltages to a supply voltage terminal.

For this reason, Roohparvar can not be modified by McClure's teachings to reach the subject matter of claim 1 in the manner the Examiner suggests. Any teaching in McClure of applying high voltages to supply voltage terminals (Applicant does not admit to any such teaching in McClure) is irrelevant in the face of Roohparvar's express requirement that high voltages be applied to memory terminals.

Analogous arguments apply as well to the subject matter recited in the other independent claims. Applicant accordingly requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-21.

Applicant believes that the combination of "Admitted prior art" with Sher and Roohparvar fails to reach the claimed subject matter in more ways than simply by not teaching applying a high voltage to the supply voltage terminal. For this reason, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's statements that "Admitted prior art" or combinations of references "substantially disclose" the claimed subject matter. Applicant reserves the right to present additional arguments in support of patentability over these references.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: February 22, 2005
Customer No. 25,181
FOLEY HOAG LLP
155 Seaport Blvd
Boston MA 02210-2600
Office Tel.: (617) 832-1230
Fax: (617) 832-7000

Scott E. Kamholz
Reg. No. 48,543
Attorney for Applicant
Direct Tel.: (617) 832-1176